

### **REMARKS**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in response to the Office action mailed June 14<sup>th</sup>, 2006. Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 4 and 7. Claims 1-8 are pending in the application.

Applicant appreciates Examiner's careful review and consideration of the present application.

#### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 3 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

In response, applicant has amended claim 3 such that it now depends directly on independent claim 1. This has been done for the purpose of overcoming the objection. Applicant requests reconsideration and removal of the objection under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as to claim 3.

#### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102***

Claims 1-2 and 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lizee et al (US 5,671,404, hereinafter "Lizee").

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kanaegami et al (US 5,297,039, hereinafter "Kanaegami").

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Adler et al (US 2003/0033295, hereinafter "Adler").

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

*'the system being programmed to mine data from a structured information report for analyzing, and comprising:*

*a data mining module for mining data from the structured information report, the data mining module comprising:*

*a parameter obtaining sub-module for obtaining mining parameters and a scanning command; and  
a querying sub-module for querying data from the structured information report in accordance with the mining parameters'.*

Applicant submits that Lizee does not teach, disclose, or otherwise suggest the features highlighted above, as set forth in claim 1 as amended.

In figures 1A, 1B, and 3, Lizee discloses an automatic information retrieval system with a computer having a link to a database system. The database system contains a plurality of retrieval objects, and a query inputting device. Each object satisfies one or more query conditions. The query inputting device is for specifying a query expressed as a conjunction of query conditions. The system provides an Automatically Relaxable Query (ARQ) that comprises a list of query conditions ordered in descending degree of importance. Lizee further discloses that the results of the ARQ search are presented in a simple and intuitive way by informing users of the marked conditions of the ARQ. That is, the Lizee system tests the database for retrieval objects, with a query composed of the conjunction of all marked query conditions and the current query condition if at least one query condition of the list is marked, or with a query composed of the current query condition if there is no query condition marked in the list; and the Lizee system then marks the current query condition if retrieval objects are found.

However, Lizee fails to teach anything like the structured information report as recited in amended claim 1. It is submitted that Lizee does not disclose, teach, or suggest "a data mining module for mining data from the structured information report". For at least the above reasons, Lizee does not disclose, teach, or even suggest the features of "a parameter obtaining sub-module for obtaining mining parameters and a scanning command; and a querying sub-module for querying data from the structured information report in accordance with the mining parameters", as recited in claim 1.

In addition, claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

***'a scanning sub-module for scanning the structured information report'.***

Applicant submits that Lizee does not disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest the feature highlighted above, as set forth in claim 1 as amended.

Applicant asserts that Lizee fails to disclose the feature of scanning the structured information report as recited in amended claim 1. According to Lizee, only one ARQ is required to be defined, and the ARQ will do the search automatically. Furthermore, Lizee obtains and displays the results of the ARQ search simply by informing users of the marked conditions of the ARQ, not through the structured information report and the mined data as recited in claim 1. Therefore, applicant submits that the system of claim 1 of the present application is substantially different from Lizee's system.

In conclusion, applicant submits that there is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion in Lizee of the limitations highlighted above, as set forth in amended claim 1. That is, Lizee fails to teach or suggest the system of claim 1. Claim 1 is novel, unobvious and patentable over Lizee under both 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claim 1 on Lizee are requested.

Claims 2-3 depend directly from independent claim 1, and respectively recite additional subject matter. Therefore, claims 2-3 should also be allowable over Lizee.

Furthermore, claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

***'a scanning sub-module for scanning the structured information report;***

***an identifying sub-module for identifying whether data stored in a field of the structured information report match the mining parameters; and***

***a marking sub-module for marking an identified field of the structured information report with a designated mark'.***

Applicant submits that Kanaegami does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the features described above, as set forth in claim 1 as amended.

In figures 1-6, Kanaegami discloses a text information extraction device for automatically extracting information contents of texts and for outputting the obtained information as information structure called an analysis network, such that an accurate and reliable search can be easily implemented. The analysis network is a tabular representation of technically essential points comprised in an input text. The technically essential points include elements contained in the text, and relations between the elements also contained in the text.

Applicant asserts that Kanaegami fails to disclose the feature of marking an identified field of the structured information report with a designated mark as recited in amended claim 1. According to Kanaegami, a line in the analysis network can be marked when the line in the analysis network matches a line in a concept template. The concept template includes technical information in the form of lines, the technical information consisting of elements and relations between the elements. By contrast, the system of claim 1 of the present application provides marking a field of the structured information report when the field of the structured information report matches the mining parameters. Moreover, the structured information report and the marked field of the structured information report are the search results presented to users. However, Kanaegami only outputs and display the analysis network with marked lines as search results. Therefore, applicant submits that the system of claim 1 of the present application is substantially different from that of Kanaegami. That is, Kanaegami fails to teach or suggest the system of

claim 1. Claim 1 is novel, unobvious and patentable over Kanaegami under both 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claim 1 on Kanaegami are requested.

Further, as noted above, claim 1 as amended recites in part:

*'the system being programmed to mine data from a structured information report for analyzing, and comprising:*

*a data mining module for mining data from the structured information report, the data mining module comprising:*

*a parameter obtaining sub-module for obtaining mining parameters and a scanning command; and*

*a querying sub-module for querying data from the structured information report in accordance with the mining parameters'.*

Applicant submits that Adler does not disclose, teach or otherwise suggest the features described above, as set forth in claim 1 as amended.

Adler discloses that a user searches a query in at least one database. During the search step, the user may interact with the search results by selecting or rejecting one or more of the search results. Adler further discloses that when the user is pleased with the search results obtained with the refined concept query or the revised search query, said refined concept query or said revised search query may be used as the final search query for submission to other document databases (Adler, para. 90). However, Adler does not disclose, teach or even suggest anything like the structured information report as recited in amended claim 1.

Further, since Adler fails to teach the structured information report, it is submitted that Adler does not disclose, teach or suggest "a data mining module for mining data from the structured information report". Accordingly, applicant submits that Adler does not disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of "a parameter obtaining sub-module for obtaining mining parameters and a scanning command, the mining parameters being

used for mining detailed data and commands for scanning; and a querying sub-module for querying data from the structured information report in accordance with the mining parameters”, as recited in amended claim 1. Adler only creates a revised search query, and does not obtain mined information from the initial search results. By contrast, the system of claim 1 of the present application can mine data from the structured information report. Therefore, applicant submits that the system of claim 1 of the present application is substantially different from that of Adler. That is, Adler fails to teach or suggest the system of claim 1. Claim 1 is novel, unobvious and patentable over Adler under both 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. 103. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claim 1 on Adler and allowance of the claim are respectfully requested.

Claim 4, as amended, recites in part:

*“displaying a structured information report and a scanning image, wherein the scanning image comprises a scanning needle”.*

Applicant submits that none of Lizée, Kanaegami and Adler discloses, teaches, or otherwise suggests the feature highlighted above, as set forth in claim 4 as amended.

Applicant asserts that Lizée fails to disclose the feature of “scanning the structured information report and a scanning image, wherein the scanning image comprises a scanning needle”, as recited in amended claim 4. According to Lizée, only one ARQ is required to be defined, and the ARQ will do the search automatically. Furthermore, Lizée obtains and displays the results of the ARQ search simply by informing users of the marked conditions of the ARQ, not through the structured information report and a scanning image with a scanning needle as recited in claim 4. Therefore, applicant submits that the method of claim 4 of the present

application is substantially different from Lizée's method. That is, Lizée fails to teach or even suggest the method of claim 4.

In addition, applicant asserts that Kanaegami fails to disclose the feature of "scanning the structured information report and a scanning image, wherein the scanning image comprises a scanning needle", as recited in amended claim 4. Kanaegami only outputs and displays an analysis network with marked lines as search results presented to users, while claim 4 of the present application presents users with the structured information report and a scanning image with a scanning needle. Therefore, applicant submits that the method of claim 4 of the present application is substantially different from that of Kanaegami. That is, Kanaegami fails to teach or even suggest the method of claim 4.

In addition, applicant asserts that Adler fails to disclose the feature of "scanning the structured information report and a scanning image, wherein the scanning image comprises a scanning needle", as recited in amended claim 4. According to Adler, a revised search query in at least one database is created through a refined concept query or a revised search query. When the user is pleased with the search results obtained with the refined concept query or the revised search query, said refined concept query or said revised search query may be used as the final search query for submission to other document databases. However, Adler does not disclose anything like the feature of displaying the structured information report and a scanning image with a scanning needle, as recited in claim 4 of the present application. That is, Adler fails to teach or even suggest the method of claim 4.

In addition, claim 4, as amended, recites in part:

***'obtaining mining parameters and a scanning command'.***

For at least reasons similar and corresponding to those asserted above in relation to the parameter obtaining sub-module of amended claim 1,

applicant submits that Lizze does not teach or suggest the feature of "obtaining mining parameters and a scanning command".

Furthermore, claim 4, as amended, recites in part:

***'scanning fields of the structured information report;  
identifying whether a scanned field contains data matching the  
query sentence; and  
marking the field if the field contains data matching the query  
sentence'.***

For at least reasons similar and corresponding to those asserted above in relation to the scanning sub-module, the identifying sub-module and the marking sub-module of amended claim 1, applicant submits that Kanaegami does not teach or suggest the features of "scanning fields of the structured information report; identifying whether a scanned field contains data matching the query sentence; and marking the field if the field contains data matching the query sentence".

Moreover, claim 4, as amended, recites in part:

***'obtaining mining parameters and a scanning command'.***

For at least reasons similar and corresponding to those asserted above in relation to the parameter obtaining sub-module of amended claim 1, applicant submits that Adler does not teach or suggest the feature of "obtaining mining parameters and a scanning command".

In summary, none of Lizze, Kanaegami and Adler discloses, teaches or otherwise suggests the present invention having the above-described features as set forth in claim 4 as amended. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is not only novel over Lizze, Kanaegami and Adler under U.S.C. §102, but also unobvious over Lizze, Kanaegami and Adler under U.S.C. §103. Reconsideration and removal of the rejections of claim 4 and allowance of the claim are requested.



Claims 5-8 depend directly from independent claim 4, and respectively recite additional subject matter. Therefore, claims 5-8 should also be allowable over Lizee.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Lee et al.

By 

Wei-Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325  
Foxconn International, Inc.  
P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive,  
Santa Clara, CA 95050  
Tel. No.: (408) 919-6137